

THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER.

Vol. 52 of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER
will commence on November 2nd, 1907.

**ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION,
WHICH MUST BE PAID IN ADVANCE:**

£1 6s.; by post, £1 8s.; Foreign, £1 10s. 4d.

Cheques payable to H. VILLERS.

OFFICE: 27, CHANCERY LANE.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

FUNDS	- - - - -	£5,500,000
INCOME	- - - - -	£722,000
YEARLY BUSINESS	- - - - -	£2,790,000
BUSINESS IN FORCE	- - - - -	£21,000,000

THE PERFECTED SYSTEM of Life Assurance is peculiar to this Society
and embraces every modern advantage.

PERFECTED MAXIMUM POLICIES.

WITHOUT PROFITS.

The Rates for these Whole Life Policies are very moderate.

Age	Premium	Age	Premium	Age	Premium
30	£1 7 8 %	30	£1 16 %	40	£2 10 %

£1,000 POLICY WITH BONUSES

According to last results.

Valuation at 2½ p.c.:—Hm. Table of Mortality.

Duration	10 yrs.	20 yrs.	30 yrs.	40 yrs.
Amount of Policy	£1,199	£1,488	£1,794	£2,067

Full information on application to

THE MANAGER, 10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 28, 1907.

* The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS.....	760	CORRESPONDENCE.....	774
AIRSHIPS—A LEGAL PROBLEM	771	OBITUARY.....	774
AVOIDANCE OF SETTLEMENTS UNDER 18	772	LEGAL NEWS.....	774
ELIZ. C. 5.....	772	CREDITORS' NOTICES.....	774
REVIEWS	773	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.....	775
PUBLIC GENERAL STATUTES.....			

Current Topics.

Solicitors in the Eighteenth Century.

We print elsewhere a letter from Mr. Justice MATHERS, of the Court of King's Bench, Manitoba, in which he briefly supplements our recent citation, from a periodical published in 1808, of remarks as to the overcrowding of the Bar at that period, with an entry from EVELYN'S Diary under date the 4th of February, 1700, relative to the then excessive number of attorneys. The diarist says that Parliament had "voted that the exorbitant number of attorneys be lessened," and he adds that they "are now indeed swarming and evidently causing law suits." This amounts to a charge of "common barratry," which is defined as being a "common mover, exciter or maintainer of suits or quarrels in courts of record or other courts"; and it may possibly be some evidence of the correctness of EVELYN's statement that a quarter of a century later it was thought necessary to provide, by 12 Geo. 1, c. 29, "for avoiding the great mischiefs and abuses which arise from infamous and wicked persons practising as attorneys or solicitors in courts of law and equity," that any person convicted of (among other things) common barratry who practised as an attorney or solicitor should be liable to be transported for seven years.

The Alterations in Death Duties.

ATTENTION should be directed to the alterations as to the amount and management of death duties which are made by the Finance Act, 1907. Section 12 substitutes a new scale of estate duty for that contained in the Finance Act, 1894. It is only, however, in the case of estates exceeding £150,000 that a change is made. From £150,000 to £250,000 the duty is to be levied at the rate of 7 per cent instead of £6 10s., and there are corresponding increases on larger estates. Instead of the maximum of 8 per cent. on estates exceeding a million, the duty is to be £10 per cent. on one million, with higher rates on the excess over that sum varying with the size of the estate. Between a million and a million and a half the excess pays £11 per cent. Over three millions, the excess over one million pays £15 per cent. So that on an estate of four millions, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer has the luck to get it, his haul will be £550,000, instead of the £320,000 under the scale hitherto existing. The new scale applies in the case of persons dying on and after the 19th of April last, but where a future interest has been *bond fide* sold or mortgaged before that date, the purchaser or mortgagee is only to be liable to pay the old duty on the interest falling into possession. Section 13 extends the power of the commissioners under section 8 (11) of the Finance Act, 1894, to remit the payment of estate duty or other death duties—that is, any death duties may be remitted after the expiration of twenty years from the death of the deceased on the application of any person accountable or liable for the duty or interested in the property. By section 16 of the recent Act, aggregation is no longer to be required in the case of property settled by a person who died before the 1st of August, 1894, but upon passing on death it will be treated as an estate by itself.

Certificates of Discharge from Estate Duty.

AN IMPORTANT extension is given by section 14 of the Finance Act, 1907, to the power of the commissioners to grant certificates of discharge from estate duty. A certificate of discharge may be given either under sub-section 1 or sub-section 2 of section 11 of the Act of 1894. Sub-section 1 applies where the rate of estate duty is readily ascertained after the death, and where it is either paid or the commissioners are satisfied that it will be paid. They must then, if required by the person accounting for the duty, give a certificate to that effect, and the certificate discharges from any further claim for estate duty the property shewn by it to form the estate or part thereof. In ordinary cases a certificate can be obtained under this sub-section at any time after the death, and can be used as an answer to the ordinary requisition by a purchaser of property of the deceased for evidence that the duty has been paid. But sometimes it is impossible to ascertain at once the entire value of the property which is to be aggregated for the purpose of estate duty, and the rate of duty consequently cannot be

finally determined. In this case the scheme of subsection 2 is available. After the lapse of two years from the death the person accountable for estate duty can deliver to the commissioners and verify a full statement to the best of his knowledge and belief of all the property passing on the death and the several persons entitled thereto, and the commissioners can thereupon determine the rate of estate duty in respect of the property for which the applicant is accountable, and on payment of duty at that rate they must give a certificate of discharge. It is now provided by section 14 of the Act of 1907 that the commissioners may entertain such application whenever made, and it will no longer, therefore, be necessary to wait for the lapse of two years from the death. This will materially facilitate the giving of certificates of discharge, and will consequently facilitate the realization of the property of the deceased.

Execution on Building Plant.

A BUILDING owner occupies a favoured position as to the right to seize, upon the builder's default, materials which he has brought on the land. An agreement that all such materials shall become his property is not a bill of sale so as to require registration under the Bills of Sale Acts (*Reeves v. Barlow*, 12 Q. B. D. 436), and the agreement is equally exempt when it forfeits the materials to the owner upon his re-entry on the land on the default of the builder in fulfilling his contract: *Ex parte Newitt* (16 Ch. D. 522). Moreover, the title of the owner prevails over that of the trustee in bankruptcy of the builder, provided, of course, that the agreement is not so drawn as to make the owner's title arise on the bankruptcy: *Re Keen & Keen* (1902, 1 K. B. 555). But the recent case of *Byford v. Russell* (1907, 2 K. B. 522) before a Divisional Court (PHILLIMORE and BRAY, JJ.) shews that there are limits to the owner's security, and if a judgment creditor of the builder has seized the building material before the owner's title has arisen he will be preferred to the owner. In that case the building agreement provided that, if the builder should neglect to proceed with due diligence, the owner might give him notice in writing requiring that the works should be proceeded with in a reasonable manner and with reasonable despatch. After such notice the builder was not to be at liberty to remove any plant or materials, but these were to be subject to a lien in favour of the owner from the date of the notice until it had been complied with. On the 6th of October, 1906, during the execution of the works, the sheriff seized the building plant and materials brought on the premises by the builder in execution of a judgment obtained against the builder. On the 8th of October, while the plant was still upon the premises, the owner gave the builder notice to proceed with the works. He claimed that by virtue of this notice he was entitled to a lien on the plant, and that the sheriff was not at liberty to proceed with the execution. But the court held that he had no interest in the goods until the notice, and that it was too late for him to acquire such interest after the sheriff had seized. This is a contingency which should be carefully considered in preparing such agreements.

The Late Lord Davey.

Lord MACNAGHTEN contributes to the recent issue of the Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation an interesting estimate of the late Lord DAVEY as advocate and judge. As he says, few persons can have had better opportunities of judging of his ability and work; they were both pupils of WICKENS, V.C., and their friendship in after life was unbroken. One of the most novel facts stated is the strange misgiving and hesitation with which DAVEY took silk. One would have supposed that he would have been conscious of his powers as an advocate and would have rejoiced in the extended opportunity to display them within the bar. We remember a similar case of a man who afterwards became an eminent leader and a distinguished judge telling us, with obvious sincerity, when he took silk that he expected to have to wait for years for a decent practice, and he might not, after all, obtain it. So little can the course of events be foreseen. Lord MACNAGHTEN justly styles DAVEY a consummate advocate; we should be disposed to say that for a difficult case, in which there were obscure points in favour of the other side which might turn the balance of decision, he was unsurpassed. We well recall listening to his

argument in a case of this kind with which we were well acquainted before the Court of Appeal; it struck us, knowing the points of danger, as the most masterly piece of advocacy we had ever heard. And, what is more, it was obvious that but for one man of subtle and powerful intellect, who was then a member of the court, and who divined the weak points in the case, the argument might have succeeded. Lord MACNAGHTEN gives another instance of the effect of DAVEY's advocacy even in his early days within the bar: "The famous question of Lord St. LEONARDS' missing will was in debate. It was only as an onlooker and an idler that I was there. The court was crowded. The front row was crammed with leading counsel from the Court of Probate, the Common Law Courts, and the Equity Bar. There had been a good deal of talk going on for some time and no little repetition. The judges were getting impatient. Everybody was beginning to feel rather bored when DAVEY rose to address the court. He was so self-composed, his language was so well chosen, his argument so lucid and concise, that the attention of every one present was riveted at once. I have always thought it was one of the best things I ever heard done." As a judge Lord DAVEY took very high rank: he was eminently patient, lucid and fearless. "No one knows better than one of his colleagues," says Lord MACNAGHTEN, "how much he added to the strength of the House of Lords and the Privy Council, or what weight of authority was lost, and what wealth of learning perished, when the grave closed over the most accomplished lawyer of his day."

The Deceased Wife's Sister Act.

AN INTERESTING commentary on the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Act, 1907, is contributed by Lord LINDLEY to the *Times* of the 23rd inst. He points out that, like almost all modern Acts of Parliament which are the result of compromises, it is by no means so clear and consistent as it should be, but some of its effects he considers to be plain enough. Marriages within the degrees prohibited by the Prayer Book were not declared absolutely void till Lord LYNDHURST's Act (5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 54), nor were the children of such marriages illegitimate unless the marriage was judicially declared void in the lifetime of the parents. Lord LYNDHURST's Act declared them to be "absolutely null and void to all intents and purposes whatsoever." Of these marriages the Legislature have in the recent Act dealt only with that between a man and his deceased wife's sister, but the opposition which was developed by a section of the Established Church has led to the Act being far less simple than it would otherwise have been. Section 1 declares that the marriage, whether contracted before or after the Act, shall not be void or voidable "as a civil contract," leaving it to be inferred that it is still open to be impugned in some other character. But Lord LINDLEY observes that, whatever may be the object and effect of these words, no court in the kingdom can now treat such marriages as illegal. Moreover, although not plainly stated in the Act, it necessarily follows that the children are made legitimate, not only in future, but retrospectively, though rights of other people acquired before the passing of the Act are expressly protected by section 2. The chief complications will probably arise from the attempt to leave it open to the Church of England to continue its own ban upon such marriages. As regards the clergy the position is anomalous. The marriage of a clergyman with his deceased wife's sister is made lawful by section 1, but section 4 leaves him open to ecclesiastical censure as if the Act had not passed. The precise effect of such censure Lord LINDLEY does not profess to explain. It may be doubted, indeed, whether the necessity for explaining it in this connection will ever arise. A bishop, who derives his position from the law of the land, is not likely to carry his disapproval of the Act so far as to censure what that law has expressly approved. And at most he can only censure a clergyman; the laity, at any rate, are exempt. The Act reserves to the clergy the right to refuse to solemnize marriages of the kind in question, and this refusal is probably the limit to which clerical opposition—assuming it to be persisted in—will be carried. On the other hand, Lord LINDLEY observes that the clergyman's right to solemnize them follows from the fact that they are made lawful as civil contracts, and from the language of the second proviso to section 1, which

authorizes a refusing clergyman to permit any other clergyman to perform the ceremony instead of himself. The legal effect, says Lord LINDLEY, is plainly to entitle each clergyman to do as he thinks proper in the matter. "It follows," he says, "that no clergyman of the Church of England can be judicially censured or suspended or deprived of his benefice if he himself solemnizes, or if he permits some other clergyman to solemnize, a marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister in his church." In conclusion, he points out that, for legal purposes, the "law of the Church" and the "Canon Law" are of no importance except so far as they are part and parcel of the law of the country, though, owing to some persons using "law" in a different sense, it is easy to speak of a "law of the Church" which is superior to the law of the country. Such higher law may, of course, be voluntarily adopted by members of a religious society among themselves, but, as Lord LINDLEY temperately points out, it has nothing to do with the law as enforced by the courts of this country.

The International Law Association.

THE MEETING of the International Law Association on the 29th to 31st of August in Portland, Maine, U.S.A., resulted in the discussion of several subjects of recognized importance, though the concurrent sitting of The Hague Conference forcibly illustrates the difficulty of arriving at international agreement when the military or naval requirements, real or fancied, of powerful States happen to be in the way. Attention may be called to the suggestions put forward by Lord Justice KENNEDY, the president of the meeting, for dealing with the difficult question of contraband. These were, (1) that a list should be prepared by international agreement of articles manufactured and primarily or ordinarily used for naval or military purposes, or used in the construction of such articles, and that only articles in this list should be absolute contraband; (2) that *res encipitis usus*, including coal and provisions, should be treated only as relative contraband—that is, as liable to seizure by a belligerent only if destined for the use of military or naval armaments or stations—and that the burden of proving such destination should be on the captor, the penalty being pre-emption and not confiscation; and (3) that on failure of such proof, damages should be recoverable from the government of the captor. Further suggestions dealt with the exemption of mails and the cargo and passengers of mail ships, and the limitation of the area of the right of search. These suggestions would tend to limit the interference by belligerents with the trade of the world, and they may bear fruit in time; but, as we have said, the results of the Hague Conference are not encouraging as to early international agreement on sane lines. Another important matter which was discussed was the intervention by States to secure the fulfilment of contracts in favour of their own citizens entered into with other states. This was introduced by Chief Justice BALDWIN in a paper in which he argued for the "Drago doctrine"—that is, against the right of a State to collect debts for its subjects by forcible measures, as illustrated by the action of Great Britain, Germany, and Italy against Venezuela. It appears that it is now common for South American governments to endeavour to secure this result by inserting in their contracts with foreigners a provision that such persons are not to have recourse to their governments in respect of any non-fulfilment of its obligation by the contracting government. Breach of contractual obligations is hardly a matter which under any circumstances calls for the employment of armed force, and it is probably better to leave persons who contract with doubtful governments to bear the risks which they voluntarily undertake.

Barristers with Political Engagements.

WE HAVE always thought it little less than a miracle that a leading barrister, whose practice is so heavy that he requires a number of deputies, assistants, and devils, and cannot find time for five minutes' talk with his oldest friends, should yet be able to represent a constituency in Parliament, to attend the divisions, and master the political questions of the day. But in every country the man of law is also the man of politics, and applications are constantly made to grant him facilities in the division of his duties. An application was made some time ago

in one of the law courts of Paris, which began its labours at eleven o'clock in the morning, to adjourn a case for a fortnight on the ground that the avocat engaged in it, a member of the Chamber of Deputies, had been called away by his political duties. The President observed that there had been two previous adjournments, and that the chamber would certainly not wish that justice should be hindered by the absence of avocats who happened to be deputies. It further appeared that the chamber would not sit before two o'clock in the afternoon, and the court, thinking that counsel could attend in the interval, dismissed the application. The House of Commons has taken to sitting earlier in the afternoon than formerly, but so far we have not heard of motions in the courts for an adjournment to enable counsel to attend to their parliamentary duties. We are not disposed to think that such motions would be favourably received by the bench, and they might in some cases give little satisfaction to the clients of the learned gentleman making the application.

Airships—A Legal Problem.

IN view of the successful experiments with the "dirigible war-balloon" made recently at Farnborough, as well as similar experiments on the Continent, it is extremely probable that airships will soon be constructed for the purpose of conveying passengers from place to place above the surface of the ground. When this happens, a good many legal problems will have to be solved. We propose to deal with one of the first of these problems that is sure to arise, viz.: Will an owner of land be entitled to prevent such an airship from passing over his land? The question, when it does come up for decision, will certainly be raised in an acute form, for an airship plying for profit will endeavour to keep as near the ground as practicable—say, between fifty and 100 feet under ordinary circumstances and in the open country.

The maxim of the civil law—*Cujus est solum ejus est usque ad calum*—has been constantly quoted, from COKE down to the present day, as correctly formulating the rule in English law, otherwise expressed by saying that the column of air above a piece of land belongs to the owner of that land. The maxim, however, has not the same meaning in English law that it has in the civil law; its meaning in English law is more restricted. Roman law knew nothing of what are sometimes called "horizontal hereditaments," and the rights of the person who in English law would be said to "own" a stratum of earth beneath the surface, or a flat in a house, would in Roman law be classed, not as ownership, but as a servitude. Thus, the existence of rights in the mines below, or in part of the house above, would not prevent the maxim being still true in the civil law—"allowing for exaggeration"—with respect to the owner of the site or surface; the rights of the persons entitled to the mines or the flat would only be an incumbrance on the ownership, not a negation of it. The horizontal division of land into separate ownerships is peculiar to English law: see *Humphries v. Brogden* (12 Q. B., at p. 755). The rule, therefore, that the column of air above belongs to the owner of the land or site is a mere presumption, which is at once rebutted by showing that another person's ownership begins at a point some distance vertically above the surface, and extends in a horizontal direction above the whole of the ground site: see *Corbett v. Hill* (L. R. 9 Eq. 671).

Even as a rebuttable presumption, however, the maxim *Cujus est solum ejus est usque ad calum* has been called a "fanciful phrase," a "legal fiction," or "legal theory," used to justify the principle "that the man who has land has everything above it, or is entitled, at all events, to object to anything else being put over it": per BARR, M.R., and BOWEN, L.J., in *Wandsworth Board of Works v. United Telephone Co.* (13 Q. B. D., at pp. 915, 919). The maxim has thus been a good deal whittled down.

In order to be entitled to prevent an airship passing through the column of air above his land, the owner must, of course, shew that his legal rights have been infringed. He may be able to do this without alleging that any right of property has been infringed, and in that case he would have to shew damage

of some sort. He need not, however, shew actual damage if he can prove a technical trespass, and in order to prove a trespass he must shew that the column of air above his land is his property, and, in fact, included in the ownership of his land. Conversely, if it be not a trespass for an airship to pass over a piece of land, then the horizontal stratum of the atmosphere through and along which the airship passes is not part of the property owned by the owner of the surface land below. The important and difficult question will be: Up to what height above the surface of the land is the atmosphere or vacant space the property of the landowner, or part of his land?

It has been decided that at a height of thirty or forty feet the column of air so far belongs to the landowner as to entitle him to prevent an electric wire being stretched across the land: *Wandsworth Board of Works v. United Telephone Co.* (13 Q. B. D. 904); *Finchley Electric Light Co. v. Finchley Urban District* (1902, 1 Ch. 866; 1903, 1 Ch. 437). It has also been decided that discharging a bullet over land at a height of about seventy-five feet from the surface does not constitute a trespass, and the atmosphere at that height cannot, therefore, be the property of the landowner: *Clifton v. Bury* (4 Times L. R. 8); and see *Pickering v. Rudd* (4 Camp. 219). In *Pickering v. Rudd* Lord ELLENBOROUGH thought that nailing a board to the side of a house so as to overhang a neighbour's land was no more a trespass than sailing over land in a balloon; he also, in expressing his opinion that firing a gun over land would not be a trespass, made no reference to the height above the ground at which the bullet might be supposed to pass.

Now, both the decisions above referred to as to electric wires (*Wandsworth Board of Works v. United Telephone Co.* and *Finchley Electric Light Co. v. Finchley Urban District*) were decisions by judges of first instance, though in each case, singularly enough, the Court of Appeal came to a different conclusion without affecting the point decided as to the general rights of landowners with respect to wires. In view of the fact that the question has not yet been properly before the Court of Appeal, and having regard to the opinions expressed by Lord ELLENBOROUGH in *Pickering v. Rudd*, it seems worth while to try and find some means of bringing the cases of bullets, electric wires, and balloons within a common principle. It is submitted that the germ of such a common principle is to be found in the words, already quoted, of BOWEN, L.J., in *Wandsworth Board of Works v. United Telephone Co.*: "The man who has land . . . is entitled at all events to object to anything else being put over it." If the right to the enjoyment of the column of air above a piece of land were no longer to be regarded as in the nature of a proprietary right, but as a right to the enjoyment of the column of air without such interference as would amount to a nuisance, then the cases which decide that the passing of a bullet over land in itself gives no cause of action, and that the permanent erection of an electric wire over land does give a cause of action, would be capable of being referred to a common principle analogous to the ordinary right to light and air. Under this principle actual ownership might be held to extend only to so much of the column of air above the land as was necessary for the use of buildings erected on the land, whilst the owner would be entitled to restrain (as a nuisance) anything amounting to improper interference with his enjoyment of the upper part of the air. If this be thought too great a change in what has been supposed to be the theory of the law on this point, the case of *Colls v. Home and Colonial Stores* (1904, A. C. 179) may be cited as an instance of one theory being substituted for another—with respect to the law of light and air.

If it were once established that it is on the footing of not doing anything amounting to a nuisance, rather than of not interfering with proprietary rights, that airships were not allowed to cross land above the surface as a matter of course where and how they pleased, there would be no difficulty in establishing a general rule as to the proper distance from houses, etc., to be observed. The use of airships would certainly entail special legislation dealing with them, and the adoption of a broad principle, such as is suggested above, would make the required legislation easier and more effective.

Avoidance of Settlements under 13 Eliz. c. 5.

The judgment of KEKEWICH, J., in *Ideal Bedding Co. (Limited) v. Holland* (1907, 2 Ch. 157) upon the avoidance of voluntary settlements is important in regard to two points, the nature of the property which will render the settlement liable to avoidance, and the costs of a trustee who unsuccessfully defends the settlement. In that case the plaintiffs were a Canadian company, and the defendant, C. HOLLAND, who had been in their employment as book-keeper and cashier, had misappropriated some £2,875, and had, in December, 1905, acknowledged the misappropriation in writing. In February, 1906, he was arrested in this country and lodged in prison, pending proceedings for his return to Toronto. An order for his return was made on the 16th of March, 1906. While in prison he executed a settlement, dated the 13th of February, 1906, of a reversionary interest to which he was entitled under the will of his father, who had died in December, 1905. By this will the testator gave his real estate and the residue of his personal estate on trust for sale and conversion and for division of the proceeds, after the death of his wife, between his son C. H. HOLLAND and the defendant C. HOLLAND in a specified manner. By the settlement C. HOLLAND assigned all his interest under the will to SLY and BURROUGHS on trusts for his wife, A. M. HOLLAND, and issue. The settlement was prepared by BURROUGHS on the instructions, taken in prison, of C. HOLLAND, who stated that he had given the plaintiffs security for their debt in the shape of a bill of sale and assignment of life policies. In March, 1906, an agreement was prepared expressed to be between C. HOLLAND of the first part, his wife of the second part, the settlement trustees of the third part, and the plaintiffs of the fourth part, with the object of having the settlement declared void by the court, and it was executed by C. HOLLAND, SLY, and the plaintiffs, but BURROUGHS refused to execute it. This agreement was dated the 30th of March. On the 31st of March the plaintiffs recovered judgment in the King's Bench Division for the amount misappropriated by C. HOLLAND, and on the 2nd of April issued the writ in the present action, claiming to have the settlement declared void on the ground that it was fraudulent, and made by the defendant, C. HOLLAND, to delay, hinder, and defraud his creditors. At the date of the trial the testator's residuary trust estate consisted mainly of railway preference stock, colonial stock, a mortgage on real estate, and cash at the bank.

At the trial KEKEWICH, J., found, as the result of the evidence, that the insolvency of C. HOLLAND at the date of the settlement was proved, and that the circumstances were such as to render it obnoxious to the statute 13 Eliz. c. 5, if, having regard to the provisions of that statute and to the property conveyed, the settlement ought to be treated as one made to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors; and whether this was so was left for further argument. The statute of ELIZABETH provides, as is well known, that "for the avoiding and abolishing of feigned, covinous, and fraudulent" conveyances, as well of lands and tenements as of goods and chattels, every conveyance of lands, tenements, hereditaments, goods, and chattels to the intent to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors shall, as against the persons so hindered, delayed, or defrauded, be void. As the law stood when this statute was passed, there was no method by which the plaintiffs or other creditors of C. HOLLAND could have taken in execution the property which was the subject of the settlement, or made it available for their debts, and hence the settlement, if the law had remained unaltered, could not have been treated as hindering or delaying them. But this is by no means the case. The law has been frequently altered so as to assist creditors in the recovery of their debts, and the scope of the statute of Elizabeth has grown with the law. "Property," said KEKEWICH, J., in the present case, "which was not originally within the reach of creditors has from time to time been brought within their reach, and whenever that has been done the courts have been prompt to recognise that such other property can be disposed of fraudulently as against creditors, that is, so as to delay, hinder, or defraud them in pursuing newly conferred rights of proceeding."

As regards the property in question it was contended on behalf of the plaintiffs that it had been made available for creditors in two ways, both by means of a charging order under the Judgments Act, 1838 (1 & 2 Vict. c. 110), and by the appointment of a receiver by way of equitable execution, and that the settlement was void as against them and other creditors because it prevented them from having recourse to these processes. Under section 14 of the Act of 1838 stocks or shares in any public company in England standing in the name of a judgment debtor in his own right, or in the name of any person in trust for him, may be the subject of a charging order, and by the Judgments Act, 1840 (3 & 4 Vict. c. 82), this was extended to all interests in stocks and shares, whether in possession, remainder, or reversion, and whether vested or contingent. It was held, indeed, in *Dixon v. Wrench* (L. R. 4 Ex. 154) that the statutes did not apply where, under the provisions of a will, the judgment debtor had an interest only in the proceeds of sale of stock and shares, and not in stocks and shares themselves. But in *Bolland v. Young* (1904, 2 K. B. 824) the effect of this decision was confined to cases where there was an absolute trust for sale, and it was held not to apply where, in the course of the administration, the stocks and shares might become divisible *in specie* among the beneficiaries. "There is," said STIRLING, L.J., "no express obligation to convert, and there is nothing which impliedly imposes such an obligation. There is no imperative trust for sale. The judgment debtor may hereafter acquire an absolute title to a portion of the stock *in specie*, and so long as the stock remains unsold, he has, in my judgment, an interest in it." KEKEWICH, J., treated the present case as being on the same footing, that is, as being wanting in an imperative trust for sale; and consequently the defendant, C. HOLLAND, had, under the will, such an interest in the railway stock as would have entitled the plaintiffs to obtain a charging order but for the settlement. To this extent, therefore, the settlement operated to hinder them.

The distinction between cases where there is an imperative trust for sale and those where the beneficiary may take the stocks *in specie*, so as to have an interest in the stocks and not merely in the proceeds of sale, is certainly not satisfactory. Indeed, it is not easy to say what is an imperative trust for sale if the trust in the present case was not of that character. It was an ordinary trust for conversion which in form is imperative, although, by direction of the beneficiaries, a sale may not in fact become necessary. The more natural course is to adopt the suggestion of KEKEWICH, J., that *Dixon v. Wrench* (*supra*) is no longer to be treated as an authority, and then any beneficiary entitled to share in the proceeds of sale of stock has an interest in the stock which can be made the subject of a charging order under the Judgment Acts. But in addition to this remedy it was argued that, but for the settlement, the plaintiffs would have been entitled to obtain the appointment of a receiver of C. HOLLAND's reversionary interest by way of equitable execution, and that upon this ground they were delayed within the meaning of the statute of ELIZABETH. From all the inquiry that an investigation of this subject would involve the learned judge shrank. "After consulting many authorities," he said, "and pondering over the matter, I have come to the conclusion that full treatment of the question would require something in the nature of a lecture or treatise, which it is better to avoid unless absolutely necessary." The difficulty is to see how the appointment of a receiver in such a case can be made of actual benefit to the creditor so as to justify the conclusion that the settlement of the property delayed him.

The question of the appointment by way of equitable execution of a receiver of an equitable reversionary interest in personal estate was decided in *Tyrrell v. Painton* (1895, 1 Q. B. 202), where it was held that such an appointment was within the jurisdiction of the court. The interest could not be taken under an *elegit*, and, on failure of the legal remedy, equitable execution was available. LINDBY, L.J., observed that during the life of the tenant for life there would be nothing for the receiver to receive, nor in the meantime did the appointment create any charge on the equitable interest, but he did not regard this failure of immediate efficacy as fatal. "The appointment of a receiver does not create a charge, but it operates as an injunction to restrain the defendant from himself receiving the

proceeds of sale, and may possibly be useful." In *Re Marquis of Anglesey* (1903, 2 Ch., p. 731) SWINFIN EADY, J., carried the matter further, and said that the order prevented the debtor from dealing with the moneys to the prejudice of the judgment creditor, and it also prevented any subsequent judgment creditor from gaining priority over the creditor obtaining the order, if at the date when the order was obtained the property of the judgment creditor could not be taken in execution or made available by any other legal process. With this statement of the law KEKEWICH, J., agreed, and hence he held that the settlement was within the statute of ELIZABETH because it hindered the plaintiffs in their remedy by way of equitable execution. He considered, however, that the proper form of order was not to direct the settlement to be given up and cancelled. This overlooked the possibility of there being a surplus after satisfying the claims of creditors. It was sufficient to direct the trustees to concur in all acts and things necessary for making the property available for satisfying the claims of the plaintiffs and all other creditors of C. HOLLAND.

As to the costs of the trustee BURROUGHS—his co-trustee SLY was not before the court—the learned judge held that the form of order avoiding the settlement was not material. Where a settlement is avoided entirely, then *prima facie* there is no fund left out of which the trustees can have their costs of unsuccessfully defending it; but this *prima facie* rule is not now acted on, and in *Merry v. Pownall* (1898, 1 Ch. 306) KEKEWICH, J., allowed trustees, who had acted properly in the defence, to retain their costs out of funds in their hands which had been subject to the settlement until its avoidance. "The strict rule," he said, "that when the fund is gone the trustee shall not have his costs, has not been applied lately. Where the trustees have acted properly they ought to be allowed their costs." In the present case he held that the defendant BURROUGHS had acted in good faith in being a party to the settlement, and had done no more than his duty in endeavouring to protect it for the benefit of those who were the beneficiaries under it. He exercised his discretion, therefore, by saying that he was to have his costs out of the trust estate, and, if he was to have them at all, it followed that he was entitled to them as between solicitor and client.

Reviews.

Where to Find Your Law.

WHERE TO FIND YOUR LAW: BEING A DISCURSIVE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY UPON THE VARIOUS DIVISIONS AND SUB-DIVISIONS OF THE LAW OF ENGLAND, AND THE STATUTES, REPORTS OF CASES, AND TEXT-BOOKS CONTAINING SUCH LAW. WITH APPENDICES FOR FACILITATING REFERENCE TO ALL STATUTES AND REPORTS OF CASES, AND WITH A FULL INDEX. By ERNEST ARTHUR JELLY, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. THIRD EDITION. Horace Cox.

Everyone is supposed to know the law, but this is an impossible counsel of perfection, and even the most learned lawyer may be content if in many branches he knows where to find the law. In this he will receive material assistance from Mr. Jelley's volume, which now appears in a third edition. The extent and minuteness of his survey of the records and expositions of the law is shown by the fact that its various departments are distributed over nearly sixty chapters, and in each of these reference is made to statutes, to leading cases, and to text-books. Many standard works cover different branches of the law, and it is natural that references to the same works—"Bullen and Leake," for instance, and Smith's *Leading Cases*—should frequently recur; but the author has also enumerated in their proper place, and given some estimate of, a host of text-books dealing with particular subjects, and there are, we imagine, very few works which have escaped his notice. As the title-page intimates, the writer's style is discursive, and he does not omit to beguile his wanderings through the "dusty purloins of the law" with such quotations and reflections as the subject in hand suggests. Thus Dickens is made to furnish an introduction for the law relating to charities, and Scott starts the reader on the consideration of costs. But these lighter garnishings are not allowed to detract from the main purpose of the book, and the practitioner will often find it a useful guide to the information he is in search of.

The death is announced of Mr. George Harold Urnson, of Stone's Wood, Limpsfield, Surrey, one of the Commissioners in Lunacy, which took place at St. Leonards on Sunday last. He was appointed secretary to the Commissioners in Lunacy in 1888, and a Commissioner in 1895.

Correspondence.

Solicitors in the Eighteenth Century.

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter*.]

Sir,—I observe that in your issue of the 3rd of August last (at p. 683) you refer, in an editorial note, to an article published in an English periodical in May, 1808, containing some observations upon the overcrowding of the legal profession.

The condition of affairs described by the writer of the article referred to was, however, a great improvement on that which prevailed a century before. On the 4th of February, 1700, John Evelyn made the following entry in his diary: "Parliament voted that the exorbitant number of attorneys be lessened (now indeed swarming, and evidently causing law suits and disturbance, eating out the estates of the people, provoking them to go to law)."

Winnipeg, Sept. 13.

T. G. MATHERS.

[See observations under head of "Current Topics."—ED. S.J.]

Obituary.

Sir E. W. N. Knocker.

We regret to record the death of Sir Edward Wollaston Nadir Knocker, C.B., of Dover, solicitor. He was admitted in 1870; had been town clerk of Dover for nearly forty years, and registrar of the Cinque Ports and registrar of the Court of Record for many years. He succeeded his father, Mr. Edward Knocker, F.S.A., in the office of town clerk. He was colonel and hon. colonel commanding the 1st Volunteer Battalion "The Buffs" until 1903, when he retired. He was made C.B. in 1896, and was knighted in 1901.

Legal News.

General.

A telegram from Calcutta says that two military officers were attacked while travelling in Eastern Bengal by a Bengali barrister, who was armed with large knives, and one was severely wounded. The assailant has been captured. He is a man of good position and wealth.

Everybody will be glad to learn, says a writer in the *Globe*, that Lord Justice Farwell, who has been absent from the courts since the spring, has so far recovered from his illness that he expects to be able to resume his place in the Court of Appeal at the commencement of the Michaelmas sittings.

The following particulars in a deed on record in a certain county of North Carolina are, says the *Central Law Journal*, copied unchanged from the Book of Deeds, with the exception only of the name of the unfortunate landowner: "Begging [sic] at Beck's South corner, running thence North 50 feet; thence West 50 feet; thence South 50 feet; then East 50 feet to beginning, this being a plot of land 50 feet square cut from the back end of the said Jemima Jones."

Mr. Justice Pickford, says the *Full Mall Gazette*, will make a worthy representative of this country at the International Maritime Conference which opened at Venice on Wednesday. Few of our judges have a more extensive knowledge of the subjects likely to come up for discussion. He practised for many years in the Liverpool courts, and as a mercantile lawyer he made steady headway to the top of his profession. He was chosen to represent the British case before the Commission which sat in Paris two years ago to inquire into the Russian attack on the Hull trawlers.

Mr. W. F. Craies, writing in the *Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation* on the Criminal Appeal Act, says of the proposed new court: The draftman of the Bill, in combining the system of review by appeal and review on reference, indicates the weak point of the Bill. The new court is to be, on the one hand, an ordinary court of justice and, on the other, a sort of judicial committee to advise the Crown on petitions to admit appeals for clemency. In exercising the prerogative of mercy, the Crown may refuse to avail itself of the consequences of conviction by verdict, but where a court of justice is called on to take up the position of the Crown on a criminal appeal, it is invited to depart from its proper sphere. Under the Act it is empowered, nay required, to take upon itself the final appreciation of the facts of a criminal case upon a perusal of the shorthand notes taken at the trial, and upon evidence never submitted to a jury and which might produce upon that lay tribunal a very different impression from that produced on the judicial mind. Experience and the precedents already given point to the conclusion that, if criminal appeal in the modern sense is to be allowed, it would be better to allow it on precisely the same lines as in civil cases, i.e., substantially on the grounds on which it is now allowed in criminal cases in the King's Bench Division, but subject to the rule, now applied in civil cases, that no new trial is to be ordered except for a substantial miscarriage of justice. Under the new Bill the judges will either be too shy of interfering with the jury, which will cause further appeals to the Home Office, or too ready to interfere, which will impair the position of the jury in criminal trials.

Not long ago it was discovered, says a correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle*, that one of the numerous "Tube" Acts contained a clause providing that nothing in the Act should interfere with the rights and privileges of the London and Suburban Railway Company under their special Act. This section was overlooked by the tube company affected for some time, but when at last counsel were instructed to advise on the subject, no trace of the Act could be discovered, although the aid of the King's Printers, the Stationery Office, and the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons were successively invoked. In the end it was found that the statute which had caused so much anxiety was an imaginary one; that the line it related to was a myth, and even the company that had projected it never existed.

At the recent autumnal meeting of the Association of Chambers of Commerce, Mr. Stuart Deacon (Liverpool) moved "That the present delays in the hearing of cases on appeal, both in the Court of Appeal and in the House of Lords, are detrimental and injurious to the commercial interests of the country." He said the statistics of the Court of Appeal showed the extreme desirability of some radical change being made. When the Court of Appeal opened their work at the beginning of the legal year, October, 1906, there were no fewer than 365 cases put down on appeal, and many of these dated back to June, 1905, so that the appellants had been waiting seventeen months to have their cases heard. Going back to the previous year, the number of appeals waiting was 303, so that between the two legal years there had been an increase of sixty-two cases in arrear. That was a serious state of things for the community. Mr. S. Humphries (Bristol) seconded. Mr. J. Milne Henderson (Edinburgh) suggested that the words "House of Lords" should be omitted, and the words "in our Supreme Courts" substituted, so as to include Scotland. The suggestion was accepted and the resolution carried in that form.

A full bench—consisting of nine judges—of the Chief Court of the Punjab have, says the *Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation*, recently had before them the question—highly important from a professional point of view—whether a legal practitioner may make his remuneration in a case contingent on the success of the case, or to use the common phrase, take a "back-fee"—that is, a fee which is to be paid back in whole or in part if the case fails. In England the traditions of the bar have long proscribed such an agreement, and section 11 of the Solicitors Act, 1870, expressly prohibits it as between client and solicitor. In nearly all parts of India also—in Madras, in Allahabad, in Calcutta, and in Bombay—such agreements are not permitted; but the case has been otherwise in the Punjab, where the practice has largely prevailed, owing to a decision some thirty years back of Sir M. Plowden, a judge of high authority in the province. In his opinion there was nothing against public policy in a stipulation that a pleader should be paid an additional sum by his client on condition of his conducting the case to a successful issue: it was calculated, he thought, to secure to the client a degree of zeal and diligence on the part of his pleader in conducting the case which the client would not otherwise get. There is certainly something in this. But it is from this very stimulus to zeal which the back-fee gives that its dangers arise. It tempts legal practitioners to resort—as experience has proved—to improper means in order to win cases. More than that, it leads to gambling in litigation, to those speculative actions with which Indian courts are by no means unfamiliar. It is, therefore, satisfactory to find that the Punjab court, with two dissentients only out of nine, have condemned the practice. There is nothing, of course, inherently disgraceful in it, but in the interests of the profession, in the maintenance of a high standard of honour, it is—well, undesirable.

Creditors' Notices.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 17.

BATTY, CATHERINE, Bradford	Oct 12	Newton, Bradford
CHADBURN, BRAMWELL, Halifax, York, Corn Merchant	Oct 14	Farrar & Co, Bradford
CLARKER, ELIZABETH, Norwich	Oct 23	Watson & Everett, Norwich
COSTIGAN, JOHN, Hanover-street rd	Oct 16	Spearsley, Dancer, Inn House, Strand
DOBBIE, GEORGE, Colchester, Builder	Oct 21	Proudfoot & Chaplin, Verulam bldgs, Gray's inn
EVANS, MORGAN, Yatalyfer	Oct 14	Rowlands, Swansea
FARMER, GEORGE WHITTON, Looe, Cornwall	Nov 1	Burton & Dyson, Gainsborough
FARE, CLARA ELIZABETH, Sheffield	Oct 21	Smith & Co, Sheffield
FESTON, HENRY PHILIP, The Hague, Netherlands	Oct 24	Garr & Co, High Holborn
FEITH, UWE, Bradford	Oct 21	Chandler, Newgate, Lincoln's Inn
GOUTH, EMILE, Ealing, Commercial Agency	Oct 19	Rostall, Wyldes Green
HARRISON, JOHN WILLIAM, Leeds	Sept 29	Willey, Leeds
HARRISON, JOSEPH PAUL CHRISTOPHER, Elm Tree rd, St John's Wood, Journalist	Oct 17	Elliott, Bradford
HAYWARD, ONSLOW, Leamington, Draper's Buyer	Oct 28	Davies, Leamington
HODGSON, GEORGE MALLINDRE, Kilmarsh, Derby, Farmer	Oct 28	Bramley & Son, Sheffield
HUPFER, JOHN, Deeping Gate, Northampton, Farmer	Oct 21	Sharpe & Wade, Market Deeping
MCALLISTER, JOHN, Liverpool, Chief Steward	Oct 15	Smith & Son, Liverpool
MARSH, WILLIAM, West Bromwich	Jan 18	Caddick & Son, West Bromwich
PHILLIPS, RODWELL, Cardiff, Deal Carrier	Oct 19	Yorath & Jones, Cardiff
PLANT, HENRY WALTER, MD, Liverpool	Oct 15	Smith & Son, Liverpool
PRESTON, WILLIAM, Leeds	Sept 28	Willey, Leeds
READ, DAVID, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Grocer	Sept 28	Bell, Newcastle
SOUSE, JOSEPH, Fishponds, Bristol	Nov 16	Tarr & Sons, Bristol
SIMPSON, SARAH, Heaton Moor, Lancs	Oct 26	Makinson & Co, Manchester
STROUD, ANNA MARIA, Yeovil	Sept 30	Wat & Co, Yeovil
SPENCE, MAX, Highbury grove	Oct 1	Lawrence G Spiegel, 38, Gt St Helens
TAYLOR, JOSEPH, Hale, Chester	Oct 25	Lawson & Co, Manchester
THORPE, JAMES ANN, Leeds	Oct 20	Clark & Whittington, Leeds
TINKLE, JOSEPH, Cheltenham, Basket Maker	Oct 19	Steel, Cheltenham
WENNER, ALFRED, Manchester, Shipping Merchant	Oct 17	A & G W Fox, Manchester

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 17.

FIRST MEETINGS.

BADDELEY, ALFRED ANTHONY, King's Heath, Worcester, Station Sept 26 at 12.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 BALL, GEORGE, Braintree, Essex, Labourer Oct 2 at 2 Shirehall, Chelmsford
 BILSBOROUGH, HAWLEY, & Co, Acres In, Brixton, Furniture Dealers Sept 27 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carew st
 CARTER, CHARLES STANHOPE, Herne Bay Sept 26 at 9.15 Off Rec. 68a, Castle st, Canterbury
 COHEN, JACOB BENJAMIN, Leeds Sept 25 at 11 Off Rec. 22, Park row, Leeds
 CLARKE, WALTER JOHN, King's rd, Chelsea, Cheesemonger Sept 26 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carew st
 COLE, SAMUEL, Lifford rd, Stoke Newington, Builder Sept 26 at 12 14, Bedford row
 COLLIER, JOHN HENRY, Brooklands, Cheshire Sept 25 at 3 Off Rec. 82, Byrom st, Manchester
 DAVIES, JOHN HUGH, Ebos, Donibagh, Builder Sept 25 at 12 Crypt Chambers, Eastgate row, Chester
 EARP, JOHN WILFRED, King's Newton Sept 26 at 11 Off Rec. 47, Full st, Derby
 EDWARDS, EDMUND, Kingston upon Hull Sept 26 at 11 Off Rec. York City Bank Chambers, Lowgate, Hull
 EVERETT, THOMAS, Tunbridge Wells, Grocer Sept 26 at 12 Clarendon Restaurant, Broadway, Tunbridge Wells
 GARNER, GEORGE, Bedford, Coal Merchant Sept 25 at 3.30 Moses Halliley & Morrison's, Mill st, Bedford
 GREEN, ALBERT, Bangor, Glam, Mason Sept 25 at 10.45 Off Rec. County Court, Townhall, Merthyr Tydfil
 HARRISON, JOHN WILLIAM, Bathgate, Derby, Farmer Sept 26 at 13 Off Rec. 47, Full st, Derby
 HAWKINS, JOHN, Burnham on Crouch, Essex, Oyster Merchant Oct 2 at 2.30 Shirehall, Chelmsford
 HEALY, JAMES, Liverpool, Produce Importer Sept 25 at 12 Off Rec. 36, Victoria st, Liver pool
 HERBERT, WILLIAM, Abertridwr, Glam, Collier Sept 26 at 11 Off Rec. Post Office Chambers, Pontypridd
 JORDAN, THOMAS HENRY, and HENRY ADAMSON, Stockton on Tees, Painter Sept 27 at 11.30 Off Rec. 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
 KILLICK, HARRY, Cox Green, nr Cranleigh, Surrey, Coal Merchant Sept 25 at 11.30 182, York rd, Westminster Bridge
 LAWRENCE, MARY ANN, Erdington, Warwick, Sub Post-mistress Sept 26 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 LOCKWOOD, HERBERT WATSON, Sheffield, Architect Sept 25 at 11.30 Off Rec. Figures In, Sheffield
 MANN, ISAAC, Sevenhampton, Farmer Sept 26 at 8.15 County Court bldgs, Cheltenham
 MARSHALL, JOHN THOMAS, Devizes, Wilts, Solicitor Oct 2 at 12 Off Rec. 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 MITCHELL, FRANK, Charles sq, Hoxton, Estate Agent Sept 26 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carew st
 PERRETT, WILLIAM, Penrhos, Glam, Collier Sept 26 at 10.30 Off Rec. Post Office Chambers, Pontypridd
 PETRE, CARL GUSTAV TRODOR, Sunderland, Coal Exporter Sept 25 at 3 Off Rec. 3, Manor pl, Sunderland
 POWER, JOHN PLATAU, Victoria st, Company Promoter Sept 26 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carew st
 PRANCE, ISAAC, Goosby, Berks, Watchmaker Sept 25 at 12 1, St Aldates, Oxford
 PULMAN, EDWIN JOHN, Merthyr Tydfil, Cycle Dealer Sept 25 at 11 Off Rec. County Court, Townhall, Merthyr Tydfil
 PURDY, ALFRED JAMES, and WILFRED LAWRENCE PURDY, Bath, Stock Brokers Sept 25 at 12.30 Off Rec. 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 PURVIS, ROBERT, Whitburn, Durham, Builder Sept 25 at 11 Off Rec. 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
 RICHARDSON, JOHN, Manchester, Wholesale Grocer Sept 25 at 2.30 Off Rec. Byrom st, Manchester
 RUBTHORN, WILLIAM, Bedford, Cab Proprietor Sept 25 at 4 Moses Halliley & Morrison's, Mill st, Bedford
 RUDDICK, THOMAS SIMON, Bedcar, York, Grocer Sept 27 at 11.30 Off Rec. 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
 SCOTT, WILLIAM, Whittingham, Northumberland, Farmer Sept 25 at 2.30 Off Rec. 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
 SHONE, WILLIAM, Bolton, Painter Sept 27 at 3 19, Exchange st, Bolton

SILVERBLATT, JOSEPH, Poplar, Draper Sept 27 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carew st
 SINGERS, CHARLES ALBERT, Leeds, Tea Merchant Sept 25 at 11.30 Off Rec. 22, Park row, Leeds
 SOULBY, C. ERNEST, Muswell Hill, Physician Sept 25 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carew st
 THOMAS, WILLIAM, Cardiff Sept 26 at 3 Off Rec. 117, St Mary st, Cardiff
 THREADINGHAM, JOSEPH CHARLES, Balilton rd, Herne Hill, Fishmonger Sept 27 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carew st
 TIVITY, ARTHUR, and TIVITY, LEONARD, Malvern, Derby, Wheelwrights Sept 26 at 11 Off Rec. 47, Full st, Derby
 TOLMINSON, RICHARD WILLIAM, Worcester, House Decorator Sept 26 at 11.30 Off Rec. 11, Copenhagen st, Worcester
 WHITTAKER, EDGAR, Stocksbridge, York Sept 25 at 12 Off Rec. Figures in, Sheffield
 WILLIAMS, THOMAS JOSEPH EDWARD, Birmingham, General Draper Sept 27 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 WILLIS, NORMAN, Budock, Cornwall, Farmer Sept 26 at 12 Off Rec. 82, Marof row, Bradford
 WOODHEAD, RACHEL, Wyke, Bradford Sept 25 at 3 Off Rec. 22, Marof row, Bradford
 WRIGHT, CHARLES, Leicester, Builder Sept 26 at 12 Off Rec. 1, Bertride st, Leicester
 WRIGHT, WALTER SHOOTER, Reading, Practical Sports Outfitter Sept 26 at 12 14, Bedford row

ADJUDICATIONS.

BENSON, DAVID, Nottingham, General Dealer Nottingham Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
 BISHOP, RICHARD GEORGE, Leeds Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 13
 CLEAR, WALTER JOHN, King's rd, Chelsea, Cheesemonger High Court Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
 CONNELL, JACOB BENJAMIN, Leeds, Passover Cake Manufacturer Leeds Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
 CONNELL, MYRA LEVI, Liverpool, Fancy Goods Dealer Liverpool Pet July 27 Ord Sept 13
 COLLIER, JOHN HENRY, altrincham, Manchester Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 13
 EDWARDS, JOHN MELMUS, Swans, Monumental Stone Cutter Abertillery Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
 GARNER, GEORGE, Bedford, Coal Merchant Bedford Pet July 26 Ord Sept 14
 GOURLEY, HARRY HART, Gosforth, Northumberland, Doctor of Medicine Newcastle on Tyne Pet Aug 2 Ord Sept 12
 HARSHDINE, SAMUEL, Chaddes Hulme, Chester, Joiner Stockport Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
 HEAD, ALFRED GROVES, Bournmouth Poole Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
 HEALY, JAMES (generally known as JAMES F. HEALY), Liverpool, Produce Importer Liverpool Pet Aug 20 Ord Sept 14
 HERBERT, WILLIAM, Abertridwr, Glam, Collier Pontypridd Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 12
 HUGHES, OWEN JOHN, Llasiyfni, Quartermaster Bangor Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
 KILLICK, HARRY, Cox Green, nr Cranleigh, Surrey, Coal Merchant Guildford Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 13
 KRAUN, HUBERT SYDNEY, Chancery In, Publisher High Court Pet May 29 Ord Sept 14
 LOVETT, WILLIAM, Chelwick Bradford Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
 MARLOW, JAMES, Holbourne, Alton, Hants, Farmer Winchester Pet Aug 23 Ord Sept 11
 MILLER, MARY, Leeds, Leeds Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
 MILWARD, GEORGE HENRY, Middle Mayfield, Stafford, Journeyman Joiner Burton on Trent Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
 REYNOLDS, CHARLES JOHN, Paignton, Devon, Bus Driver Plymouth Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
 ROBINSON, WILLIAM HOWARD, Chelsea, Artist High Court Pet Aug 2 Ord Sept 13
 RUSSELL, FRANK SCOTT, Birmingham, Pictorial Post Card Dealer Birmingham Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 12
 SCOTT, WILLIAM, Whittingham, Northumberland, Farmer Newcastle on Tyne Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 12
 SHONE, WILLIAM, Bolton, Painter Bolton Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
 SHOPLAND, EMMELINE EILEEN, Lynton, Devon Barnstaple Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
 SINGERS, CHARLES ALBERT, Leeds, Tea Merchant Leeds Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
 THREADINGHAM, JOSEPH CHARLES, Balilton rd, Herne Hill, Fishmonger High Court Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

WHEELERS, ARTHUR HOWARD, Shanklin, I of W, Park Butcher Newport and Ryde Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15
 WILLIAMS, THOMAS JOSEPH EDWARD, Birmingham, General Draper Birmingham Pet Aug 16 Ord Sept 12
 WILLS, NORMAN, Budock, Cornwall, Farmer Truro Pet Aug 26 Ord Sept 12
 WOODHEAD, RACHEL, Wyke, Bradford Bradford Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 20.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BAKER, SAMUEL THOMAS, jun, and FREDERICK CHARLES BAKER, Southwark Bridge rd, Artisan Well Engineers High Court Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17
 BATH, BENJAMIN MORRIS, Pillowwell, West Dean, Glos, Baker Newport, Mon Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
 BOONE, WILLIAM HANSON, Greenwich, Mining Engineer High Court Pet May 17 Ord Sept 16
 BURNS, ROBERT, Ensholme, Manchester, Packer Manchester Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
 CAMPBELL, JOHN ARCHIBALD, Burnley Burnley Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15
 CHAPMAN, BENNET, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer Luton Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17
 DAVIES, DAVID JAMES, Trefoend, nr Pontypriod, Glam Butcher Pontypriod Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 18
 DIX, ERNEST, Brentwood, Essex, Builder Chelmsford Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
 DYBALL, WILLIAM, Dukinfield, Cheshire, Grocer-grocer Ashton under Lyne Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
 FARRANT, JOHN, Brighton, Coal Merchant Brighton Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18
 FUNNEL, THOMAS, Seaford, Sussex, Builder Lewes Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
 GLENDRILL, JOHN REYNARD, Southport, Outfitter Liverpool Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 18
 GOWEN, LESTER, Hastings, Florist Hastings Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17
 GRACE, ISAAC, jun, Liverpool, Poultry Dealer Liverpool Pet Aug 27 Ord Sept 18
 HARRIS, THOMAS EDWARD, Pengam, Glam, Underground Contractor Merthyr Tydfil Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17
 JONES, WILLIAM ERNEST, and ALFRED MISHAIL, Stockport, Painters Stockport Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
 KEMP, HARRY, Huddersfield, Butcher Huddersfield Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18
 KRATER, HARRIS, Commercial rd, Draper High Court Pet Aug 25 Ord Sept 18
 MCNAUL, HERBERT ARTHUR, Chelmsford, Tobacconist Chelmsford Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
 MITCHELL, JOSEPH EDWARD, Fenchurch st, Wine Merchant High Court Pet Aug 16 Ord Sept 15
 MULLINS, WILLIAM CHARLES, Weston super Mare, Commercial Traveller Bridgwater Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15
 MUTTON, WILLIAM, Hartow rd, Paddington, Costume Manufacturer High Court Pet Aug 23 Ord Sept 16
 NICHOLSON, JEREMIAH OLIVER, Whitley Bay, Northumberland, Builder Newcastle upon Tyne Pet Aug 21 Ord Sept 17
 OAKLEY, JOSEPH, Daverton, Staffs, Builder Walsall Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
 PARKER, JOHN FREDERICK, Royal Exchange, Bootmaker High Court Pet July 18 Ord Sept 18
 PHILLIPS, DR H C, Gloucester ter, Hyde Park High Court Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 18
 SMITH, MARK, Southampton, Commission Agent Southampton Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17
 WHITMORE, SAMUEL JAMES, Sutton at Hause, Kent, Horticulturalist Rochester Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
 WILKINSON, JOHN BLISSETT, West Hanney, Berks, Fruiterer Oxford Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18
 WRIGHT, JAMES BROWN, Droylsden, Land Agent Worcester Pet July 31 Ord Sept 18
 YOUNG, ROBERT, Salisbury, Bookbinder Salisbury Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16

FIRST MEETINGS.

ATHERTON, SIDNEY W., Prestole Lane, Company Promoter Oct 1 at 11 Off Rec. 33, Victoria st, Liverpool
 BAKER, SAMUEL THOMAS, jun, and FREDERICK CHARLES BAKER, Southwark Bridge rd, Artisan Well Engineers Sept 30 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carew st
 BALE, FRANCIS ROBERT, Loughborough, Leicestershire, Grocer Sept 30 at 12 Off Rec. 1, Bertride st, Leicester
 BEASLEY, WILLIAM BABYAN, Soudies, Hants, Jeweller Pet Sept 30 at 8 Off Rec. Cambridge June, High st, Portsmouth

THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

ESTABLISHED IN 1891.

EXCLUSIVE BUSINESS—LICENSED PROPERTY.

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

630 Appeals to Quarter Sessions have been conducted under the direction and supervision of the Corporation.

Suitable Insurance Clauses for inserting in Leases or Mortgages of Licensed Property, Settled by Counsel, will be sent on application.

Sept. 28, 1907.

BENSON, DAVID, Nottingham, General Dealer Oct 1 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
 BEYNON, RICHARD, Manorbier, Pembroke, Labourer Sept 28 at 13.30 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
 BOONE, WILLIAM ANSON, Greenwich, Mining Engineer Oct 1 at 19 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 BONHILL, RICHARD GROSGE, Leeds Sept 30 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park Row, Leeds
 BURNS, ROBERT, Rusholme, Manchester, Packer Sept 28 at 11.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
 CRUMPT, GEORGE, Coppergate, nr Bewdley, Worcester, Timber Handler Oct 7 at 7 Mr 8 Thurfield, Solicitor, Kidderminster
 DYBALL, WILLIAM, Dukinfield, Cheshire, Greengrocer Sept 28 at 11 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
 EDWARDS, JOHN MEURIG, Swansea, Photographer Sept 28 at 12.45 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
 FURNELL, THOMAS, Seaford, Sussex, Builder Oct 2 at 2 County Court Office, High st, Lewes
 HAYNES, CHARLES THOMAS, Rugby, Warwick, Tailor Oct 7 at 2.15 Off Rec, 8, High st, Coventry
 HEAD, ALFRED GROSE, Bournemouth Sept 30 at 2.30 Meats, Cartis & Son, 158, Old Christchurch rd, Bournemouth
 HUGHES, OWEN JOHN, Talywern, Carmarthen, Quarryman Sept 28 at 12 Crypt chmbs, Eastgate row, Chester
 LUBBOCK, JOHN C, Marylebone rd, Marylebone, Moseleylander Oct 1 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 MILLER, MARY, Leeds Sept 30 at 11.30 Off Rec, 22, Park Row, Leeds
 PALMER, CHARLES WILLIAM, Eddington, Herne, Kent Sept 30 at 11.45 Off Rec, 68A, Castle st, Canterbury
 POOLE, ALFRED ERNEST EDWARD CLAY, Morecambe, Tobaccoconist Sept 30 at 8 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
 RUSTON, THOMAS WESTALL, Upton Snodsbury, Worcester, Innkeeper Sept 28 at 11.30 Off Rec, 11, Copenhagen st, Worcester
 RUSSELL, FRANK SCOTT, Birmingham, Pictorial Post Card Dealer Oct 3 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 SHOPLAND, EMELINE ELLIOT, Lynton, Devon Oct 1 at 3.45 High st, Barnstaple
 SMITH, MARK, Southampton, Commission Agent Sept 30 at 10.30 Off Rec, Midland Bank chmbs, High st, Southampton
 VODREY, WILLIAM, Tunstall, Bookseller Sept 30 at 11.30 Off Rec, King st, Newcastle, Staffs
 WHITMER, SAMUEL JAMES, Sutton at Hone, Kent, Horticulturist Sept 30 at 11.30 115, High st, Rochester
 WILSON, ROBERT OLIVER, Bootle, nr Liverpool, Grocer Oct 1 at 12 Off Rec, 25, Victoria st, Liverpool
 WRIGHT, JAMES BROWN, Droitwich, Worcester, Land Agent Oct 2 at 11.30 Off Rec, 11, Copenhagen st, Worcester
 WYLDE, EVERARD WILLIAM, Parracome, Devon Oct 1 at 8.45 High st, Barnstaple
 YOUNG, ROBERT, Salisbury, Bookbinder Oct 1 at 12 Off Rec, City chmbs, Catherine st, Salisbury

ADJUDICATIONS.

BATH, BENJAMIN MORRIS, Pillowell, West Dean, Glos, Baker Newport, Mon. Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
 BURNS, ROBERT, Rusholme, Manchester, Packer Manchester Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
 CAMPBELL, JOHN ARCHIBALD, Burnley Burley Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18
 DAVIES, DAVID JAMES, Trefores, nr Pontypridd, Butcher Pontypridd Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18
 DIX, ERNEST, Brentwood, Builder Chelmsford Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
 DYBALL, WILLIAM, Dukinfield, Cheshire, Greengrocer Ashton under Lyne Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
 EVERETT, THOMAS, Tividale Wells, Grocer Tambridge Wells Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 14
 FUNNELL, THOMAS, Seaford, Sussex, Builder Lewes Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 16
 GEE, WILLIAM NASH, Ferryhill Village, Durham, Boot Dealer Durham Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 16
 GOWE, LESTER, Hastings, Florist Hastings Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17
 GUY, CHARLES JAMES, Lloyd's av, Printer High Court Pet July 23 Ord Sept 14
 HARRIS, THOMAS EDWARD, Pengam, Glam, Underground Contractor Merthyr Tydfil Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17
 HOOKS, WILLIAM JAMES, London rd, Southwark, Architectural Engineer High Court Pet Aug 13 Ord Sept 14
 JONES, WILLIAM ERNEST, and ALFRED MINSHULL, Stockport, Painters Stockport Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 15
 KELLY, JOHN JAMES, Barnesfield, Iron Founder Barnesley Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 18
 KEMP, HARRY, Huddersfield, Butcher Huddersfield Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 18
 LASCELLES, THOMAS WILLIAM, Belgrave Park gdns, Hampshire High Court Pet June 20 Ord Sept 14
 MCCLAREN, HERBERT ARTHUR, Cheltenham, Tobaccoconist Cheltenham Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
 MORLEY, TOM JUN, Jasper rd, Upper Norwood High Court Pet July 20 Ord Sept 14
 MULLINS, WILLIAM CHARLES, Weston super Mare, Commercial Traveller Bridgewater Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 19
 OAKLEY, JOSEPH, Darlaston, Staffs, Builder Walsall Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 16
 PERRY, ALFRED JAMES, and WILFRED LAWRENCE PURDY, Bath Stockbrokers Bath Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 16
 PURVIS, ROBERT, Whitchurch, Durham, Builder Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 16
 ROBINSON, AMY ANN, York bldg, Adelphi, Strand High Court Pet June 30 Ord Sept 14
 SNOOKFIELD, ROBERT WILLIAM, Upper Grange rd, Bermondsey, Boot Manufacturer High Court Pet Aug 20 Ord Sept 14
 SMITH, MARK, Southampton, Commission Agent Southampton Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17
 STOOD, JOHN, Heaton Moor, nr Stockport, Restaurant Proprietor Manchester Pet Aug 13 Ord Sept 16
 WILKINSON, JOHN BLIMSTETT, West Hanney, Berk, Fruiterer Oxford Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18
 WILSON, ROBERT OLIVER, Boode, nr Liverpool, Grocer Liverpool Pet Aug 27 Ord Sept 17

YOUNG, ROBERT, Salisbury, Bookbinder Salisbury Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 18

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 24.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BATEMAN, WALTER, Kingston upon Hull, Fish Fryer Kingston upon Hull Pet Sept 21 Ord Sept 21
 BERNARD, CHARLES, Redfield, Bristol, Outfitter Bristol Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 BLENDELL, JOHN SAVILE, and CHARLES EDGAR WAKEFORD, Cardiff, Colliery Proprietors Newport, Mon Pet Aug 30 Ord Sept 19
 CADMAN, HENRY, Hunslet Carr, Leeds, Tailor Leeds Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 19
 CATTON, WILLIAM NICHOLAS, Gray's Plantation, Felbrigg, Norfolk, Builder Norwich Pet Sept 21 Ord Sept 21
 CLARKE, WILLIAM WHITCHURST, Haverfordwest, Flannel Merchant Pembroke Dock Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 CLATWORTHY, EVAN, Gorsteon, Glam, Jeweller Swansea Pet Sept 21 Ord Sept 21
 COLEBATCH, EDWIN, Kimbolton, Hereford, Farmer Leominster Ord Aug 19
 DEWAS, JAMES FOREST, H M S Hecla, Portsmouth High Court Pet July 18 Ord Sept 20
 DILGER, JOHN THOMAS WESTHORN, Sheffield, Watchmaker Sheffield Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 DREW, WILLIAM, Brynmawr, Brecon, Innkeeper Tredegar Pet Sept 21 Ord Sept 21
 EDWARDS, E. C, Argyle rd, West Ealing, Decorator Brentford Pet Aug 29 Ord Sept 20
 FOX, WILLIAM, Doddington Crossing, Swallowbank, Lincs, General Engineer Lincoln Pet Sept 20 Ord Sept 20
 GOT, EVELYN, Gainsborough, Motor Car Driver Lincoln Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 HARDING, ALBERT JOHN, Pontycymmer, Glam, Collier Cardiff Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 HOLFIELD, WILLIAM HENRY, Sunmertown, Oxford, House Decorator Oxford Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 HOLMES, JOHN, Sheffield, Timber Merchant Sheffield Pet Sept 20 Ord Sept 20
 HYDE, JOHN THOMAS, Leadham, Lincs, Grocer Boston Pet Sept 20 Ord Sept 20
 JAMES, FREDERICK STANLEY, Harley rd, Willenhall junc, Tailor's Assistant High Court Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 20
 KNAGGS, CHARLES, and ERNEST RICHARD KNAGGS, Middlesbrough, Oil Merchants Middlesbrough Pet Sept 20 Ord Sept 20
 LAWSON, WILFRED, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Butcher Birkenhead Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 20
 LEIBLING, LEWIS, Nottingham Nottingham Pet Sept 20 Ord Sept 20
 LEWIS, JOHN, Ainsell, Lancs, Greengrocer Preston Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 19
 McCUAULD, ALICE B, Southsea, Hants Portsmouth Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 20
 NICHOLS, SAMUEL, and DAVID NICHOLS, Rhyl, Flint, Printers Bangor Pet Sept 18 Ord Sept 18
 NIVEN, JOHN LANG, Withernsea, Yorks, Physician Kingston upon Hull Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 20
 OSBORNE, ARTHUR SAMUEL, Cleeethorpes, Shrimp Hawker Gt Grimsby Pet Sept 17 Ord Sept 17
 PARKER, THOMAS ARTHUR, Broadway, Shifnal, Salop, Grocer Madeley Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 POPE, EDWARD VALLE, Somerset st, Portman sq, High Court Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 20
 PRICE, JAMES, Charing, Kent, Picture Dealer Canterbury Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 ROSENBERG, SIMON, Heaton, Newcastle on Tyne, House Furnisher Newcastle on Tyne Pet Aug 22 Ord Sept 19
 SMITH, BERTHAN ROBERT, Wolverhampton, Coal Merchant Wolverhampton Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 STOWS, HENRY, Mountain Ash, Glam, Confectioner Aberdare Pet Sept 20 Ord Sept 20
 THURSTON, HENRY WILLIAM, Bedlam Moor, East Dereham, Norfolk, Farmer Norwich Pet Sept 21 Ord Sept 21
 WIDDOWSON, SAMUEL, Birmingham, Estate Agent Birmingham Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 WILLIAMS, GROBB ALBERT, and THOMAS ELIJAH ROOKES, Cwm, Mon, Builders Tredegar Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
 WOOD, GEORGE, Birmingham, Baker Birmingham Pet Sept 20 Ord Sept 20

FIRST MENTINGS.

ABRON, HENRY, and HERBERT ABRON, Monewden, Suffolk, Wheelwrights Oct 8 at 2 Off Rec, 38, Prince st, Ipswich
 BECKINGHAM, FREDERIC, jun, Cheltenham, Grocer Oct 3 at 3.15 County Court, Cheltenham
 BERNARD, CHARLES, Redfield, Bristol, Outfitter Oct 2 at 11.45 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 CADMAN, HENRY, Hunslet Carr, Leeds, Tailor Oct 2 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park Row, Leeds
 DAVIES, DAVID JAMES, Trefores, nr Pontypridd, Butcher Oct 3 at 10.30 Off Rec, Post Office chmbs, Pontypridd
 DEWAR, JAMES FOREST, H M S "Hecla," Portsmouth Pet 4 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 DEWHIRST, RICHARD, Blackpool, Baker Oct 4 at 3.30 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
 DIX, ERNEST, Brentwood, Builder and Contractor Oct 2 at 3 Shirhall, Chelmsford
 FARRANT, JOHN, Brighton, Coal Merchant Oct 2 at 11.30 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldg, Brighton
 GEE, WILLIAM NASH, Ferryhill Village, Durham, Boot Dealer Oct 2 at 12 Off Rec, 3, Manor pl, Sunderland
 GLEDHILL, JOHN REYNARD, Southport, Outfitter Oct 2 at 11 Off Rec, 25, Victoria st, Liverpool
 HARRIS, THOMAS EDWARD, Pengam, Glam, Underground Contractor Oct 3 at 12 Off Rec, County Court, Town hall, Merthyr Tydfil
 HAZELDINE, SAMUEL, Cheadle Hulme, Cheshire, Joiner Oct 3 at 12 Off Rec, Castle chmbs, 6, Vernon st, Stockport
 JONES, DAVID, Pengamford, nr Talgarth, Brecon, Farmer Oct 2 at 2.30 Tiverton Hotel, Talgarth, Brecon
 JONES, FRED, Upper Edmonton, Contractor Oct 3 at 12 Bedford row

JONES, WILLIAM ERNEST, and ALFRED MINSHULL, Stockport, Painter Oct 3 at 11 Off Rec, Castle chmbs, 6, Vernon st, Stockport

KEMP, HARRY, Huddersfield, Butcher Oct 3 at 12 The Huddersfield Incorporated Law Society's Room, Imperial Arcade, New st, Huddersfield

KRAFTER, HARRIS, Commercial rd, Draper Oct 2 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

MCLAREN, HERBERT ARTHUR, Cheltenham, Tobaccoconist Oct 3 at 2.30 County Court bldg, Cheltenham

MILWARD, GROBES HENRY, Middle Mayfield, Staffs, Journeyman Joiner Oct 2 at 11.30 Off Rec, 47, Fall st, Derby

MITCHELL, JOSEPH EDWARD, Fenchurch st, Wine Merchant Oct 3 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

MULLINS, WILLIAM CHARLES, Weston super Mare, Commercial Traveller Oct 2 at 11.30 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol

MUTTON, WILLIAM, Harrow rd, Paddington, Costume Manufacturer Oct 3 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

NICHOLS, RICHARD JONATHAN, Peterborough, Builder Oct 2 at 12 The Law Courts, Peterborough

NICHOLSON, JEREMIAH OLIVER, Whiteley Bay, Northumberland, Builder Oct 2 at 12 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne

OAKLEY, JOSEPH, Darlaston, Staffs, Builder Oct 2 at 12 Off Rec, Wolverhampton

PARKER, JOHN FREDRICK, Royal Exchange, Bootmaker Oct 3 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

PARKER, THOMAS ARTHUR, Shifnal, Salop, Grocer Oct 5 at 11.30 Off Rec, 22, Swan hill, Shrewsbury

PHILLIPS, DR H C, Gloucester ter, Hyde Park Oct 2 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

POPE, EDWARD VALLE, Somerst st, Portman sq, Oct 2 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

RAYMOND, CHARLES JOHN, Paignton, Devon, Bus Driver Oct 3 at 11 7, Buckland ter, Plymouth

ROSENBURG, SIMON, Heaton, Newcastle on Tyne, House Furnisher Oct 3 at 11 Off Rec, 30, Mooley st, Newcastle on Tyne

SLACK, WILLIAM, Buxton, Tailor Oct 3 at 11.30 Off Rec, Castle chmbs, 6, Vernon st, Stockport

WHITE, HAROLD JOHN, Clacton on Sea Oct 2 at 11 Gt Eastern Hotel, Liverpool st

WHITFIELD, FRANK JAMES, Warrington, Licensed Victualler Oct 2 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

Annual Subscription, WHICH MUST BE PAID IN ADVANCE: SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER, 26s.; by post, 28s.; Foreign, 30s. 4d.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER with regularity it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher, at 27, Chancery-lane.

Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 9d.; half law calf, 5s. 6d.

LAW.—Wanted, an Admitted Solicitor having a good knowledge of Company Law and Wind-up Practice, capable of Taxing Bills of Costs; commencing salary £150 a year.—Apply by letter, stating age, experience, and present employers, to H. B., care of Street's, 6, Serle-street, London, W.C.

SOLICITOR.—Old Rugbeian, nearly 25, 7 years in busy City solicitor's office, Desires Clerkship, with ultimate view to Purchasing a Partnership; small connection of his own; would be prepared to enter into a non-practising covenant; salary by arrangement.—Apply, A. B. K., care of "Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter," Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

CATERHAM PREPARATORY SCHOOL. Rev. P. MORGAN WATKINS, M.A., Scholar of Winchester and Brasenose, Receives BOYS to be Prepared for the Public Schools and Royal Navy at the Dene, Caterham-on-the-Hill.

E. C. Cordeau, Naval Cadetship, April, 1907.

LAW COSTS.—Testimonial: "Aug. 30th, 1907.—Mr. HARCOURT SMITH has just completed the drafting of a complicated bill of costs in the winding up of a considerable estate to our entire satisfaction, and we have no hesitation in recommending him to other members of our profession for similar work"—Apply, HARCOURT SMITH, Partnership Agent, &c., 61, Chancery-lane, London.

TO SOLICITORS.—Ex-Detective Inspector JOHN WALSH, of the Criminal Investigation Department, New Scotland Yard, after twenty-nine years' brilliant public service, now Undertakes Private and Confidential Inquiries; Divorce, Blackmail, Commercial and Probate; Branches—Montreal, New York, Boston, Paris, and Bristol.—6, John-street, Adelphi, Strand. 'Phone, 14,164 Central.

LONDON SOLICITOR Offers Seat in Small, but very busy, General Practice, to Qualified Man seeking further experience; no salary.—Apply, EXPEDDO, care of "Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter," 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

£28-10 Freehold Ground-rents, amply secured upon Four Houses situated in one of the best suburbs of London, all let to good tenants; price moderate.—For all particulars apply W. BUNNELL TUNIS, 63-65, Shoe-lane, E.C. Tel. 3755 Central.

2
ort,
son
The
m,
19
nist
ffs,
all
ant
om-
win
ime
y st
Oct
er-
st,
13
ker
5 th
13
st 3
ive
ous
few-
Bec,
Gt
aller

AID
AND
30.;

ing
KLY
that
, at
half

itor
and
nts;
sing
re of

5, 7
ship,
con-
nomy,
ter."

OL.
ar of
pared
Dens,

0th,
pleted
nding
, and
other
pply,
sory-

ector
ation
years'
Con-
and
Paris,
home,

mall,
1 Man
PEDIQ,
," 27.

mply
ated in
nants;
RUSSELL